

**REMARKS**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

**Status of Claims:**

No claims are currently being canceled.

Claims 1, 11, 21 and 22 are currently being amended.

No claims are currently being added.

This amendment and reply amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-24 are pending in this application.

**Claim Rejections – Prior Art:**

In the Office Action, claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,751,777 to Bates. This rejection is traversed for at least the reasons given below.

In its rejection of claim 1, the Office Action asserts that Figure 23, column 1, lines 54-60, and column 9, lines 25-68 of Bates teaches the claimed features of “displaying, at the client, an alias for the address of the server on which the copy of the sub-page is hosted.” Applicant respectfully disagree. In particular, while column 1, lines 54-60 of Bates mentions the word “aliases” in describing “bookmarks” that are used by a user to maintain a list of favorite sites or documents that a user expects to revisit in the future, this does not correspond to the “alias for the address of the server” feature recited in claim 1. Namely, a user may save a bookmark for www.google.com as “Search Site” on his/her list of bookmarks, this name designation by the user is only for the list of bookmarks, whereby the true URL for each bookmark is also displayed and known by the user (since the user is the person who makes the alias designation for each favorite URL). Figure 23 of Bates merely shows a pull-down menu that allows a user to add or edit a bookmark, whereby the actual URL of the selected bookmark is displayed by the user’s browser when going to the ‘selected’ favorite website.

Column 9, lines 25-69 of Bates describes relevant events handled by a main routine 70 for a browser 41, in which there is displayed a representation of a hypertext document retrieved by the browser, and in which a list of bookmarks is displayed to the user in a conventional manner. Again, the fact that a user can select an “alias” of a favorite website via a list of bookmarks, does not correspond in any way, shape or form to the features of the claimed “alias.” Rather, as is clear from Figure 23 and the description of Bates, the actual address is displayed on the URL line of the browser, which does not correspond to an alias that hides a true URL of a website to a user (for which a user wants to access).

Put in another way, the alias according to the present invention is displayed by the browser to show the identity, so to speak, of the page the user is trying to get to - and in the instance of some sites this ends up being a different URL to the one the user was intending to get to. An example of this might be if one was to type in <http://www.yahoo.co.uk>, and end up at <http://uk.yahoo.com/> - which is not the URL the user asked for, strictly speaking. In the present invention, users are diverted to a different URL just as yahoo might do as described above; and so, overall, users get served their pages quicker. The difference with the yahoo example above and the present invention is that the present invention is provided so as not to allow the users to SEE the different URL that the user is actually taken to, because that might allow the user to try to get to that URL in the future rather than a possibly different one the web operators may want them to go to, thus possibly interfering with load balancing. So, in the present invention, by analogy to the yahoo example given above, although the user might be sent to a second URL (<http://uk.yahoo.com/>), the browser would continue to display the first URL (<http://www.yahoo.co.uk>), and the user would never know the difference (and that he/she has been diverted). Thus, the alias that is being displayed at the browser in the present invention is not related at all to a bookmark, such as described by Bates, but the “alias” according to the present invention is directed to the address that the user has been directed to (whereas a bookmark is an alias of the address that the user is intending to get to, and which the user provides inputs via keystrokes to create the bookmark).

Each of the presently pending independent claims has been amended to make these “alias” distinctions explicit, so that there can be no way that Bates can be applied to the features recited in these independent claims.

Accordingly, presently pending independent claims 1, 11, 21 and 22 are not anticipated by Bates.

Still further, with respect to dependent claim 3, that claim recites that the alias is an address of a server which is adapted to translate the alias into an address of a server on which a copy of the sub-page is hosted. In its rejection of claim 3, the Office Action asserts that column 7, lines 25-35 of Bates teaches these features. Applicants respectfully disagree. Namely, column 7, lines 25-35 of Bates describes multi-target links to navigate to one or more of a plurality of available ‘targets’ in response to input received from a user, whereby each target is typically identified by its storage location (e.g., URL), filename, path, and/or other manner of addressing a document in a computer system. As further described in column 7, lines 36-45 of Bates, multi-target links identify a plurality of URLs representing the targets thereof, with at least some of the documents stored at the URLs being formatted using HTML protocol.

The above-described portions of Bates are not related at all to an alias corresponding to an address of a server which is adapted to translate the alias into an address of a server in which a copy of a sub-page is hosted. Rather, Bates provides for multiple targets to be selected based on a single input by a user, in which no “alias” that corresponds to “an address of a server in which a copy of a sub-page is hosted” is taught or suggested by Bates.

Accordingly, dependent claim 3 is not anticipated by Bates.

Still further, with respect to dependent claim 5, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that Figures 6 and 11 and column 10, lines 1-24, column 10, lines 48-50 and column 11, lines 43-54 of Bates describe the features of claim 5. Applicants respectfully disagree. Namely, Figures 6 and 11 of Bates describe a method in which each URL is actuated in sequence, in order to obtain a document at each URL, whereby there is no teaching or suggestion that once a document is retrieved from a first URL that has been actuated, subsequent URLs are not actuated. Rather, in Figures 6 and 11 of Bates, each URL is obtained in sequence, which is totally contrary to the features recited in claim 5, whereby once a first link in sequence has been actuated successfully in accordance with a predetermined criterion, the other links after that link in sequence are not actuated.

Column 10, lines 1-24 of Bates describes navigating a link routine by calling a plurality of subroutines based on a particular type of link activated by a user, whereby, once a link has been selected, decision blocks detect a specific link type and pass control to a dedicated handling routine. Column 10, lines 48-50 of Bates describes that other types of multi-target links may be supported in other implementations. Column 11, lines 43-54 of

Bates describes a method which determines whether a document has been successfully retrieved, and if not, to determine whether additional URLs remain to be processed in the link. Thus, if a document has not been successfully retrieved, the method of Bates merely moves on to the next document to be retrieved, without trying to retrieve the unsuccessfully-retrieved document from a different URL.

With respect to dependent claim 7, that claim recites that the predetermined criterion is whether, within a predetermined period of time, a predetermined step in a process of establishing connection with a server has been reached. This “server connection time-out” feature is asserted in the Office Action to be described in column 14, lines 8-15 of Bates; Applicants respectfully disagree. Namely, column 14, lines 8-15 of Bates merely describes that a chronological link routine that uses chronological criteria that define when in time a particular document should be retrieved in response to selection of the link, whereby the time may correspond to a particular time of day, or when a particular document was updated. This disclosure in Bates has nothing at all to do with determining whether a connection has been established with a server within a predetermined period of time, as recited in claim 5. Rather, it deals with a time sequence for obtaining document information from various links, without any description of establishment of link connections within a predetermine time period.

Accordingly, since Bates does not disclose or suggest the features recited in claim 7, that claim is not anticipated by Bates.

Still further, with respect to dependent claim 10, that claim recites that the predetermined criterion is the greatest progress in establishing full connection with one of the servers after a specified interval of time following simultaneous actuation of all links. The Office Action incorrectly asserts that column 6, lines 15-50 of Bates describes these features. Namely, column 6, lines 15-50 of Bates describes general features of a computer, and does not come close to describing the specific features of checking which of a plurality of fully-established links has the greatest progress, whereby all of the lower-progressed links are terminated (see those features in intervening claim 9).

Accordingly, since Bates does not disclose or suggest the features recited in claim 10, that claim is not anticipated by Bates.

With respect to dependent claim 12, that claim recites that a plurality of links are sent to the client with the first page, each pointing to a different predetermined address within the

Internet, each predetermined address being an address of a further server hosting a copy of the sub-page, and the instructions are executable upon actuation of each link. In its rejection of claim 12, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that column 23, lines 1-20 of Bates describes the features recited in that claim. Namely, column 23, lines 1-20 of Bates describes features of Figure 23, in which relative lengths of regions are sized to indicate the percentage of the targets for the multi-target link from which data has been previously accessed. Thus, in Figure 23 of Bates, about ¼ of the data has been previously accessed. There is not description in this portion of Bates as to a plurality of links each pointing to a different predetermined address within the Internet, each predetermined address being an address of a further server hosting a copy of the sub-page, as recited in claim 12. Rather, at best, only one link that is requested by a user is displayed in the display of Bates, whereby a work-in-progress icon 632 is provided on the display.

Accordingly, dependent claim 12 is not anticipated by Bates.

With respect to dependent claim 13, which recites that the alias is an address of a server adapted to translate the alias to an address of one of the further servers, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that column 7, lines 25-35 of Bates describes these features. Rather, column 7, lines 25-35 of Bates merely describes that multi-target links are utilized to navigate one or more “targets” in response to input received from a user, whereby each target is identified by URL, filename, path, and/or other manner of addressing a document in a computer system. There is no description in this portion of Bates as to an alias being an address of a server that is adapted to translate an address of one of further servers, as recited in claim 13.

Accordingly, since Bates does not disclose or suggest the features recited in claim 13, that claim is not anticipated by Bates.

With respect to dependent claim 14, it recites similar features to those discussed above with respect to claim 5, whereby Bates does not disclose or suggest such features.

Accordingly, since Bates does not disclose or suggest the features recited in claim 14, that claim is not anticipated by Bates.

With respect to dependent claim 20, it recites similar features to those discussed above with respect to claim 10, whereby Bates does not disclose or suggest such features.

Accordingly, since Bates does not disclose or suggest the features recited in claim 20,

that claim is not anticipated by Bates.

With respect to dependent claim 23, that claim recites displaying, based on a random selection, which of the plurality of links is to be actuated when the link on the first web page is selected by a user at the client. The Office Action incorrectly asserts that these features are shown in Figure 23 of Bates. Rather, Figure 23 of Bates shows a browser display in which a pull-down menu allows a user to edit a bookmark or add a bookmark, and whereby there is no description of a random selection of links to be actuated when a link on a first web page is selected by a user. Rather, in Bates, a user selects a bookmarked URL, and the browser goes to the selected URL, whereby there is no random selection of links in such a system of Bates.

Accordingly, since Bates does not disclose or suggest the features recited in claim 23, that claim is not anticipated by Bates.

Finally, with respect to dependent claim 24, that claim recites features in which a second client is provided with a second alias for the address of the another server on which the copy of the sub-page is hosted, in which the second alias of the another server is the same as the alias of the server, and in which the address of the another server is different from the address of the server. The Office Action incorrectly asserts that Figure 6, column 5, lines 54-66, column 6, lines 15-50, column 7, lines 25-67, column 8, lines 61-67, and column 13, lines 5-41 of Bates describe these features. Namely, Bates describes the concept of a “multi-target link”, which is not at all related to displaying different aliases for a same address for different clients.

Accordingly, since Bates does not disclose or suggest the features recited in claim 24, that claim is not anticipated by Bates.

**Conclusion:**

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date April 3, 2007

By Phillip J. Articola

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Customer No.: 22879  
Telephone: (202) 672-5485  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

William T. Ellis  
Registration No. 26,874

Phillip J. Articola  
Registration No. 38,819